



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/732,726

12/10/2003

William T. Ball

5564-152

2017

22442

7590

09/16/2008

SHERIDAN ROSS PC
1560 BROADWAY
SUITE 1200
DENVER, CO 80202

EXAMINER

FETSUGA, ROBERT M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3751

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/16/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/732,726
Filing Date: December 10, 2003
Appellant(s): BALL, WILLIAM T.

Craig W. Mueller
For Appellant

SUPPLEMENTAL EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the reply brief filed March 17, 2008 which is directed to the new ground of rejection made in the supplemental examiner's answer mailed January 30, 2008.

Art Unit: 3700

Response to Argument

Appellant argues at page 5 of the reply brief the Oropallo reference is not prior art to the instant application because appellant has claimed a filing date benefit(s) (under 35 U.S.C. 120) from a prior application(s) which predates the filing date of the reference. The examiner disagrees. For a CIP application to rely on an earlier filing date, the claimed invention in the CIP must be fully supported by the earlier application (MPEP 706.02 VI(B)). None of the applications relied upon by appellant disclose the claimed subject matter on appeal, notwithstanding appellant's bald statement to the contrary. Appealed claim 10 recites "a one-piece overflow fitting" (ln. 6) that includes "threads" (ln. 12). The 09/954,420 application (pat. 6,691,411) does not appear to disclose much of anything to do with an overflow fitting, noting Fig. 1 of the patent. The 10/229,533 application (pat. 6,675,406), claimed to be a continuation of application 09/593,724, does indeed disclose an overflow fitting. However, that overflow fitting is of a two-piece construction (relative to the claims) where the fitting or pipe 34 includes a separate fitting 58 which exhibits the threads 62, noting Fig. 4 of the patent. Furthermore, note

Art Unit: 3700

the explicit disclosure in the '406 patent at column 2, lines 62-64. Both patents are part of the record in the instant application as being cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed May 23, 2005.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert M. Fetsuga

/Robert M. Fetsuga/

Conferees:

Gregory L. Huson

/Gregory L. Huson/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3751

Janet C. Baxter

/Janet C. Baxter/

TC 3700 TQAS

A Technology Center Director or designee has approved this supplemental examiner's answer by signing below:

/KAREN M. YOUNG/

Director, Technology Center 3700